

LARGE-AMPLITUDE RAPID X-RAY VARIABILITY IN THE NARROW LINE SEYFERT 1 GALAXY PG 1404+226: THE ACCRETION DISK/CORONA CONNECTION

LABANI MALICK¹ AND GULAB C. DEWANGAN¹

¹*Inter-University Center for Astronomy and Astrophysics, Ganeshkhind, Pune 411007, India*

Submitted to ApJ

ABSTRACT

We present results from a detailed analysis of our 2016 *XMM-Newton* observation of the narrow-line Seyfert 1 galaxy PG 1404+226 which showed a large-amplitude, rapid X-ray variability by a factor of ~ 8 in ~ 11 ks. We use this variability event to investigate the origin of the soft X-ray excess emission and the connection between the disk, hot corona and the soft excess emitting region through UV/X-ray cross-correlation, time-resolved spectroscopy and root mean square (rms) spectral modelling. The weakly variable UV emission ($F_{\text{var,UV}}=3.9\pm0.2\%$) appears to lead the strongly variable X-ray emission ($F_{\text{var,X}}=89.0\pm0.7\%$) by ~ 33 ks. Such a UV lead is consistent with the crossing time (~ 23 ks) of the seed photons from the disk to a compact ($\sim 10r_s$) hot corona and the time required for their thermal Comptonization (~ 9 ks) giving rise to the X-ray power-law emission. The strong soft X-ray excess below 1 keV seen in the mean X-ray spectrum as well as in the time-resolved spectra is well described by both the intrinsic disk Comptonization and the blurred reflection models. The soft excess emission is found to vary together with the power-law component as $F_{\text{primary}} \propto F_{\text{excess}}^{2.01}$. The X-ray fractional rms spectrum shows an increase in variability with energy which can be described only in the framework of blurred reflection model in which both the intrinsic continuum and the reflected emission are highly variable in normalization only and are perfectly coupled with each other. Our results suggest that accretion disk provides the seed photons for thermal Comptonization giving rise to the X-ray power-law component which in turn illuminates the innermost accretion disk and gives rise to the soft X-ray excess emission.

Keywords: accretion, accretion disks — galaxies: Seyfert — galaxies: individual: PG 1404+226 — X-rays: galaxies

1. INTRODUCTION

The narrow-line Seyfert 1 (NLS1) galaxies, a subclass of active galactic nuclei (AGN) have been the centre of interest because of their extreme variability in the X-ray band (Boller et al. 1996; Leighly 1999a; Komossa & Meerschweinchen 2000). The defining properties of this class of AGN are: Balmer lines with full width at half-maximum $\text{FWHM}(\text{H}_\beta) < 2000 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ (Osterbrock & Pogge 1985; Goodrich 1989), strong permitted optical/UV Fe II emission lines (Boroson & Green 1992; Grupe et al. 1999; Véron-Cetty et al. 2001) and weaker [OIII] emission $\frac{[\text{OIII}]\lambda 5007}{\text{H}_\beta} \leq 3$ (Osterbrock & Pogge 1985; Goodrich 1989). The X-ray spectra of Seyfert galaxies show a power-law like primary continuum which is thought to arise due to thermal Comptonization of the optical/UV seed photons in a corona of hot electrons surrounding the central supermassive black hole (e.g. Haardt & Maraschi 1991, 1993). The optical/UV photons are thought to arise from an accretion disk but direct observational evidence is lacking. Similarly, the interplay between the accretion disk and the hot corona is not well understood. Many type 1 AGN also show strong ‘soft X-ray excess’ emission over the power-law continuum below $\sim 2 \text{ keV}$ in their X-ray spectra. The existence of this component ($\sim 0.1\text{--}2 \text{ keV}$) was discovered around 30 years ago (e.g. Arnaud et al. 1985; Singh et al. 1985) and its origin is still controversial. Initially, it was considered to be the high energy tail of the accretion disk emission (Arnaud et al. 1985; Leighly 1999b), but the temperature of the soft excess is in the range $\sim 0.1\text{--}0.2 \text{ keV}$ which is much higher than the maximum disk temperature expected in AGN. It was then speculated that the soft excess may result from the Compton up-scattering of the disk photons in an optically thick, warm plasma (e.g. Magdziarz et al. 1998; Janiuk et al. 2001). Currently, there are two competing models for the soft X-ray excess emission in terms of optically thick thermal Comptonization (Magdziarz et al. 1998; Dewangan et al. 2007; Done et al. 2012) and blurred reflection from partially ionized accretion disk (Fabian et al. 2002; Ross & Fabian 2005; Crummy et al. 2006; Garcia et al. 2014). However, these models sometimes lead to spectral degeneracy because of the presence of multiple spectral components in the energy spectra of NLS1 galaxies (Dewangan et al. 2007; Ghosh et al. 2016). One efficient approach to overcome the spectral model degeneracy is to study the root mean square (rms) spectrum which links the energy spectrum with variability and has been successfully applied in a number of AGN (MCG-6-30-15: Miniutti et al. 2007, 1H 0707-495: Fabian et al. 2012, RX J1633.3+4719: Mallick et al. 2016). Observational evidence for the

emission in different bands such as UV, soft and hard X-rays during large variability events may help us to probe the connection between the disk, hot corona and the soft excess emitting regions.

In this manuscript, we investigate the origin of the soft X-ray excess emission, rapid X-ray variability and UV/X-ray connection in PG 1404+226 with the use of both model dependent and model independent techniques. PG 1404+226 is a narrow-line Seyfert 1 galaxy at a redshift $z = 0.098$ with $\text{FWHM}(\text{H}_\beta) \sim 800 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ (Wang et al. 1996). Previously, the source was observed with *ROSAT* (Ulrich & Molendi 1996), *ASCA* (Leighly et al. 1997; Vaughan et al. 1999), *Chandra* (Dasgupta et al. 2005) and *XMM-Newton* (Crummy et al. 2005). From the *ASCA* observation, the 2-10 keV spectrum was found to be quite flat ($\Gamma = 1.6 \pm 0.4$) with flux $F_{2-10} = 6.4 \times 10^{-12} \text{ erg cm}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$ (Vaughan et al. 1999). The detection of an absorption edge at $\sim 1 \text{ keV}$ was claimed in previous studies and interpreted as high velocity ($0.2\text{--}0.3 c$) outflow of ionized oxygen (Leighly et al. 1997). The source is well-known for its strong soft excess and large-amplitude X-ray variability on short time scales (Ulrich & Molendi 1996; Dasgupta et al. 2005). Here we explore the energy spectrum, rms spectrum, flux-flux plot and UV/X-ray connection through a new $\sim 100 \text{ ks}$ *XMM-Newton* observation of PG 1404+226.

2. OBSERVATION AND DATA REDUCTION

We observed PG 1404+226 with the *XMM-Newton* telescope (Jansen et al. 2001) on 25th January 2016 (Obs. ID 0763480101) with a total duration of $\sim 100 \text{ ks}$. Here we analyze data from the European Photon Imaging Camera (EPIC-PN; Strüder et al. 2001) and Optical Monitor (OM; Mason et al. 2001) on-board *XMM-Newton*. We processed raw data with the Scientific Analysis System (SAS v.15.0.0) and the most recent (as of 2016 August 2) calibration files. The EPIC-PN detector was operated in the large window (LW) mode (~ 94.9 per cent ‘livetime’) using the thin filter. We processed EPIC-PN data using the task EPPROC and produced calibrated photon event file. We included unflagged single and double pixel events ($\text{PATTERN} \leq 4$) and filtered the processed PN event. We generated a GTI (Good Time Interval) file above 10 keV for the full field with $\text{RATE} < 3.1 \text{ counts s}^{-1}$ using the task TABGTIGEN and excluded proton background flares. This resulted in a filtered duration of $\sim 73 \text{ ks}$ for the cleaned EPIC-PN data. We extracted the source event from a circular region of radius 35 arcsec centered on the source while background events were extracted from nearby source free circular region with a radius of 50 arcsec. The RMF (Re-

distribution Matrix File) and ARF (Ancillary region File) were produced with the SAS tasks RMFGEN and ARFGEN, respectively. We extracted the source and background light curves for different energy bands and bin times from the cleaned PN event file using XSELECT V.2.4 c. The background subtracted light curves were produced using the FTOOL task LCMATH. We grouped the spectral data using the GRPPHA tool in order to have a minimum of 50 counts per energy bin. The net count rate estimated for EPIC-PN is (0.34 ± 0.003) counts s^{-1} resulting in a total of 1.8×10^4 PN counts.

The Optical Monitor (OM) was operated in the imaging-fast (IF) mode using only UVW1 ($\lambda_{\text{eff}} \sim 2910$ Å) filter for a total duration of 94 ks. There are a total of 20 UVW1 exposures and we found that only the last 14 exposures were acquired simultaneously with the filtered EPIC-PN data. We processed the fast mode OM data with the SAS task OMFCHAIN and generated the UVW1 light curve.

3. ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

3.1. Light Curve and Hardness Ratio

The top panel of Figure 1 shows the background subtracted EPIC-PN light curve of PG 1404+226 with time bins of 500 s. The X-ray time series clearly shows a short-term, large-amplitude variability event in which PG 1404+226 varied by a factor of ~ 8 in ~ 11 ks during the 2016 observation. The fractional root mean square (rms) variability amplitude estimated in the 0.3–10 keV band is $F_{\text{var,X}}=89.0 \pm 0.74\%$ (the uncertainty on F_{var} was calculated in accordance with Vaughan et al. 2003). Based on the variability pattern, we divided the entire 73 ks light curve into five intervals. Int 1 consists of the first 38 ks of the time series and had the lowest flux with mean count rate of 0.18 ± 0.03 counts s^{-1} and moderate fractional rms variability of $F_{\text{var,Int1}}=12.5 \pm 2.1\%$. In Int 2, the X-ray flux increases exponentially by a factor of ~ 5 with fractional rms variability of $F_{\text{var,Int2}}=47.5 \pm 1.7\%$. The duration and mean flux level of Int 2 are ~ 10 ks and 0.51 ± 0.04 counts s^{-1} , respectively. During Int 3, the source was in the highest flux state, with mean count rate of 1.38 ± 0.06 counts s^{-1} and fractional rms amplitude of $F_{\text{var,Int3}}=11.8 \pm 1.4\%$. The source was in the brightest state only for ~ 6 ks and then count rate started decreasing. In Int 4, the source flux drops by a factor of ~ 3 in ~ 6 ks with $F_{\text{var,Int4}}=47.2 \pm 2.1\%$. During the end of the observation, the source was moderately variable with $F_{\text{var,Int5}}=13.3 \pm 2.0\%$. In the bottom panel of Fig. 1, we show the UVW1 light curve of PG 1404+226 simultaneous with the X-ray light curve. The amplitude of the observed UV variability is only

Table 1. The UV and X-ray fractional Variability, F_{var} for all five intervals.

Interval No.	Time (ks)	$F_{\text{var,UV}}(\%)$	$F_{\text{var,X}}(\%)$
Int 1	0 – 38	3.47 ± 0.25	12.5 ± 2.1
Int 2	38 – 48	3.92 ± 0.49	47.5 ± 1.7
Int 3	48 – 54	3.07 ± 0.64	11.8 ± 1.4
Int 4	54 – 60	3.86 ± 0.67	47.2 ± 2.1
Int 5	60 – 73	5.87 ± 0.54	13.3 ± 2.0

$\sim 17\%$ of the mean count rate on timescales of ~ 69 ks. The fractional rms variability amplitude in the UVW1 band is, $F_{\text{var,UV}}=3.9 \pm 0.2\%$ which is much less compared to the X-ray variability. The X-ray and UV variability patterns appear significantly different suggesting lack of any correlation between the X-ray and UV emissions at zero time-lag. The duration and fractional rms amplitude for each interval are listed in Table 1.

The upper and middle panels of Figure 2 show the background-subtracted soft (0.3–1 keV) and hard (1–10 keV) X-ray light curves, respectively, with time bins of 2 ks. The soft band is observed to be brighter than the hard band, however the variability pattern and amplitude ($F_{\text{var,soft}} = 88.7 \pm 0.7\%$ and $F_{\text{var,hard}} = 88.0 \pm 3.8\%$) in these two bands are found to be comparable during the observation. The peak-to-trough ratio of the variability amplitudes in the soft and hard bands are of the order of ~ 12 and ~ 16 , respectively. In the bottom panel of Fig. 2, we have shown the hardness ratio as a function of time. A constant model fitted to the hardness ratio curve provided statistically poor fit ($\chi^2/\text{d.o.f}=47/31$), implying the presence of moderate spectral variability and the source became harder in the beginning of the large amplitude variability.

3.2. UV/X-ray Cross-correlation Analysis

To investigate the connection between the X-ray and UV emitting regions, we calculated the cross-correlation function (CCF) between the UVW1 and X-ray (0.3–10 keV) light curves using the Z-transformed discrete correlation function (ZDCF) (Alexander 2013). In the ZDCF method, all pairs from two time series are ordered according to their time difference, τ_{ij} . The ordered list is then divided into time lag bins, each comprising of a minimum of n pairs. The cross-correlation for each lag bin is calculated as

$$r(\tau) = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{(x_i - \bar{x})(y_i - \bar{y})}{(n-1)s_x s_y} \quad (1)$$




Figure 1. Top panel: *XMM-Newton*/EPIC-PN (0.3–10 keV) background subtracted light curve of PG 1404+226 observed in 2016 with time bins of 500 s. The vertical lines indicate the margin between different characteristics of the time series. Bottom panel: UVW1 light curve of PG 1404+226 with a timing resolution of 500 s extracted from the *XMM-Newton*/OM fast mode observation.




Figure 2. The upper and middle panels show the soft (0.3–1 keV) and hard (1–10 keV) X-ray light curves, respectively. The bottom panel is the corresponding hardness ratio (1–10 keV/0.3–1 keV) as a function of elapsed time, showing spectral variations. The time binning in all three panels is 2 ks.

where n is the number of pairs in a time lag bin, $\bar{x}$, $\bar{y}$ are the bin averages, and s_x , s_y are the bin standard deviations. The ZDCF method uses the Fishers Z-




Figure 3. Z-transformed discrete cross-correlation function (ZDCF) between the observed UVW1 and X-ray light curves. The dotted vertical lines represent the $1-\sigma$ interval of the time-delay between the UV and X-ray light curves. The time-lag was estimated using the maximum likelihood method.

transformation of r to estimate the confidence intervals of a measured bin correlation coefficients. The ZDCF method also determines the peak of the CCF and the corresponding lag uncertainty based on the Monte Carlo simulations (Alexander 2013). We have used minimum of 22 data points in a time bin and 10000 realizations for Monte Carlo runs to estimate the time-lag. Figure 3 shows the ZDCF for the observed UVW1 and X-ray light curves with 500 s bins. The time-lag was estimated relative to the UVW1 band and the positive




Figure 4. Left: Probability distribution of the correlation coefficient calculated in the time-lag range of 30-35 ks where the positive correlation peaks and 40-45 ks where the negative correlation peaks using ZDCF and obtained from 10000 pair of simulated light curves. Right: Probability distribution of the time-lag with the CCF greater than +0.5 and less than -0.5 and estimated from 10000 pair of simulated light curves using ZDCF.




Figure 5. Lag distribution using JAVELIN. The time-lag was calculated relative to the UVW1 band and the positive lag implies that the X-ray variations are delayed relative to the UV variations.

lag implies that the UV is leading the X-ray variations. We observed both positive and negative correlations between the UV and X-ray bands with $\text{CCF}_{\text{max}} \sim 0.62$ and ~ -0.77 at time-lags of ~ 33 ks and ~ 44 ks, respectively. We estimated the time-lag in the range -60 to 60 ks using the maximum likelihood method (PLIKE code, Alexander 2013). The lag of X-rays by UVW1 is $33.19^{+1.25}_{-1.42}$ ks, where the errors represent the $1-\sigma$ confidence intervals. To determine the significance of the observed time-lag and CCF peak, we generated 10000 pair of simulated light curves by bootstrapping method using ASTROPY v.1.3 (Astropy Collaboration et al 2013). We estimated the ZDCF and time-lag for each pair of simulated light curves. The resulting CCF and lag distribu-

tions are shown in Figure 4. Clearly, the detection of the UV lead corresponding to the positive correlation is statistically robust. To check the accuracy of the estimated time-lag, we have generated the distribution of the time-lag from 100000 realizations of the data using JAVELIN cross-correlation program (Zu et al. 2011, 2013) in the range of 0 – 50 ks. Fig. 5 shows the probability distribution of the X-ray time-lag with respect to the UVW1 band. The estimated time-lag is $32.84^{+0.19}_{-0.21}$ ks.

3.3. Spectral Analysis

We performed the spectral analysis of PG 1404+226 using XSPEC v.12.8.2 (Arnaud 1996). We employed the χ^2 statistic and quote the errors at the 90% confidence limit for a single parameter corresponding to $\Delta\chi^2 = 2.704$, unless otherwise specified.

3.3.1. Phenomenological Model

We begin our spectral analysis by fitting the 1–8 keV EPIC-PN spectrum using a continuum model (ZPOWERLW) multiplied by the Galactic absorption (TBABS). We fixed the Galactic column density at $N_{\text{H}} = 2.7 \times 10^{20} \text{ cm}^{-2}$ (Kalberla et al. 2005). This model provided $\chi^2=71$ for 50 degrees of freedom (d.o.f) with $\Gamma \sim 1.82$ and can be considered as a good baseline model to describe the hard X-ray emission from the source. Then we extrapolated our 1–8 keV absorbed power-law model (TBABS×ZPOWERLW) down to 0.3 keV. This extrapolation reveals the presence of a strong soft excess emission below 1 keV with $\chi^2/\text{d.o.f} = 11837/160$. The ratio of the observed EPIC-PN data and the absorbed power-law model is shown in Figure 6 (left). The fitting of the 0.3–8 keV data with the absorbed power-law model (TBABS×ZPOWERLW) resulted in a poor fit




Figure 6. Left: Ratio of the EPIC-PN spectral data and absorbed power-law model ($\Gamma \sim 1.82$) fitted in the 1–8 keV band and extrapolated to lower energies. The blue line represents the data-to-model ratio of 1. Right: Deviations of the observed EPIC-PN data from the absorbed blackbody and power-law model ($\text{TBABS} \times (\text{ZBBODY} + \text{ZPOWERLW})$) fitted in the 0.3–8 keV.




Figure 7. Left: The time-averaged EPIC-PN spectrum, the best-fitting model, $\text{TBABS} \times \text{ZXIPCF}(\text{ZBBODY} + \text{ZPOWERLW})$ and the deviations of the observed data from the best-fitting model. The power-law and blackbody components are shown by the dashed blue and dash-dotted magenta lines, respectively. Right: The 5 time-resolved EPIC-PN spectra, the best fitting model, $\text{TBABS} \times \text{ZXIPCF}(\text{ZBBODY} + \text{ZPOWERLW})$ and the residual spectra. The black squares, red circles, magenta triangles, blue crosses and grey diamonds represent spectral data for Int 1, Int 2, Int 3, Int 4 and Int 5, respectively.

with $\chi^2/\text{d.o.f} = 1126.5/158$. The residual plot demonstrates a sharp dip around ~ 1 keV and excess emission below 1 keV. Initially, we modelled the soft excess emission using a simple blackbody model (ZBBODY). The addition of the ZBBODY model improved the fit to $\chi^2/\text{d.o.f} = 232.1/156$ ($\Delta\chi^2 = -894.4$ for 2 additional free parameters). In XSPEC, the model reads as $\text{TBABS} \times (\text{ZBBODY} + \text{ZPOWERLW})$. The deviations of the observed EPIC-PN data from the absorbed blackbody and power-law model is shown in Fig. 6 (right). The estimated blackbody temperature $kT_{\text{BB}} \sim 100$ eV is consistent with the temperature of the soft excess emission observed in Seyfert 1 and QSOs (Czerny et al.

2003; Gierliński & Done 2004; Crumby et al. 2006; Papadakis et al. 2007). In order to model the absorption feature ~ 1 keV, we used one ionized absorber model (ZXIPCF) which has 4 free parameters: column density (N_{H}), covering fraction (C_f), redshift (z) and ionization parameter ($\log \xi$, where $\xi = L/nr^2$, L is the source luminosity, n is the hydrogen density and r is the distance between the source and cloud). We assumed that the absorbing cloud to cover the X-ray source fully and fixed the covering fraction at 1. The inclusion of the warm absorber significantly improved the fit from $\chi^2/\text{d.o.f} = 232.1/156$ to $176.5/154$ ($\Delta\chi^2 = -55.6$ for 2 additional free parameters). To test the pres-




Figure 8. Left: The EPIC-PN mean spectrum, the best-fitting absorbed disk Comptonization model (TBABS×ZXIPCF×OPTXAGNF) and the deviations of the observed data from the best-fitting model. Right: The 5 time-resolved EPIC-PN spectra, the best-fitting model, (TBABS×ZXIPCF×OPTXAGNF) and the residual spectra. The black squares, red circles, magenta triangles, blue crosses and grey diamonds represent spectral data for Int 1, Int 2, Int 3, Int 4 and Int 5, respectively.




Figure 9. Left: The EPIC-PN mean spectrum, the best-fitting blurred reflection model and the deviations of the observed data from the best-fitting model, (TBABS×ZXIPCF(KDBLUR*REFLIONX+ZPOWERLW)). The primary power-law and reflection components are shown by dotted blue and dashed cyan lines, respectively. Right: The 5 time-resolved EPIC-PN spectra, the best-fitting model, (TBABS×ZXIPCF(KDBLUR*REFLIONX+ZPOWERLW)) and the residual spectra. The black squares, red circles, magenta triangles, blue crosses and grey diamonds represent spectral data for Int 1, Int 2, Int 3, Int 4 and Int 5, respectively.

ence of out-flow, we varied the redshift of the absorbing cloud which further improved the fit to $\chi^2/\text{d.o.f} = 168.1/153$ ($\Delta\chi^2 = -8.4$ for 1 additional free parameter). In XSPEC, the 0.3–8 keV best-fitting model reads as TBABS×ZXIPCF(ZBBODY+ZPOWERLW). The EPIC-PN spectral data, the best-fitting model and the deviations of the observed data from the best-fitting model are shown in Figure 7 (left). The best-fitting values for the column density, ionization parameter and out-flow velocity (determined from the redshift of the cloud relative to the rest frame) of the warm absorber are

$$N_{\text{H}} = 10.9^{+3.0}_{-5.3} \times 10^{23} \text{ cm}^{-2}, \log \xi (\text{erg cm s}^{-1}) = 2.9^{+0.1}_{-0.1} \text{ and } v_{\text{cloud}} = -0.063^{+0.027}_{-0.028} c, \text{ respectively.}$$

In order to search for spectral variability on shorter timescales, we performed time-resolved spectroscopy. First we applied our best-fitting mean spectral model to the 5 EPIC-PN spectra extracted from the five intervals (see section 3.1). We tied all the parameters except the normalization of the power-law and blackbody components which we set to vary independently. This resulted in statistically acceptable fit with $\chi^2/\text{d.o.f} = 337.7/269 = 1.25$ and without strong residual. If we allow the blackbody temperature and photon-index of the power-

law to vary, we did not find any significant improvement in the fit with $\chi^2/\text{d.o.f} = 327.7/261 = 1.25$ ($\Delta\chi^2 = -10$ for 8 free parameters). The 5 EPIC-PN spectral data-sets, the best-fitting model and residuals are shown in Fig. 7 (right). The best-fitting spectral model parameters for both time-averaged and time-resolved spectra are listed in Table 2.

3.3.2. Physical Model

In order to examine the origin of the soft X-ray excess emission, we have tested two different physical models—thermal Comptonization in an optically thick, warm medium and blurred reflection from a partially ionized accretion disk. First, we have used the intrinsic disk Comptonization model (OPTXAGNF) (Done et al. 2012) which assumes that the gravitational energy released in the disk at each radius is radiated as a blackbody emission from the outer disk radius, r_{out} to the coronal radius, r_{corona} . Inside the coronal radius, the gravitational energy is dissipated to produce the soft excess component in an optically thick, warm ($kT_e \sim 0.2$ keV) corona and the hard X-ray power-law tail in an optically thin, hot ($kT_e \sim 100$ keV) corona above the disk. Thus, this model represents an energetically self-consistent model. The four parameters which determine the normalization of the model are the following: black hole mass (M_{BH}), dimensionless spin parameter (a), Eddington ratio ($\frac{L}{L_E}$) and proper distance (d). We fitted the 0.3–8 keV EPIC-PN time-averaged spectrum with the OPTXAGNF model modified by the Galactic absorption TBABS. We fixed the black hole mass, outer disk radius and proper distance at $10^7 M_\odot$ (Kaspi et al. 2000; Wang & Lu 2001), $400r_g$ and 397 Mpc, respectively. We assumed a maximally rotating black hole as concluded by Crumney et al. (2005) and fixed the spin parameter at $a = 0.998$. This model resulted in statistically unacceptable fit with $\chi^2/\text{d.o.f} = 237.2/154$ and a sharp dip around 1 keV in the residual spectrum. As before, we used the warm absorber model (ZXIPCF) which significantly improved the fit from $\chi^2/\text{d.o.f} = 237.2/154$ to $177.5/152$ ($\Delta\chi^2 = -59.7$ for 2 additional free parameters). We then left the redshift of the absorbing medium to vary freely in order to justify the presence of out-flow, which further improved the fit to $\chi^2/\text{d.o.f} = 168.3/151 = 1.11$ ($\Delta\chi^2 = -9.2$ for 1 additional free parameter). The EPIC-PN mean spectrum, the best-fitting absorbed disk Comptonization model (TBABS×ZXIPCF×OPTXAGNF) and the deviations of the observed data from the model are shown in Figure 8 (left). The best-fitting values for the Eddington rate, coronal radius, electron temperature, optical depth and spectral index are $\frac{L}{L_E} = 0.08^{+0.03}_{-0.06}$, $r_{\text{corona}} = 4.9^{+p}_{-1.6} r_g$, $kT_e = 0.11^{+0.007}_{-0.003}$ keV, $\tau = 100^{+p}_{-50.0}$

and $\Gamma = 1.99^{+0.19}_{-0.19}$, respectively. Then we jointly fitted the five time-resolved spectral data-sets with the absorbed disk Comptonization model and kept all the parameters tied to their mean spectral best-fitting values except the Eddington rate. This provided statistically acceptable fit with $\chi^2/\text{d.o.f} = 364.3/279 = 1.3$ and we did not notice any strong feature in the residual spectra. The 5 EPIC-PN spectral data-sets, the best-fitting disk Comptonization model and residuals are shown in Fig. 8 (right). The best-fitting spectral model parameters for both mean and time-resolved spectra are listed in Table 3.

The origin of the soft excess emission could be the blurred reflection from the ionized accretion disk (Fabian et al. 2002; Crumney et al. 2006; Garcia et al. 2014). Hence we modelled the soft X-ray excess using the reflection model REFLIONX (Ross & Fabian 2005) convolved with the model KDBLUR which blurs the spectrum due to general relativistic effects close to the rapidly rotating SMBH (Laor 1991). Then we fitted the 0.3–8 keV EPIC-PN mean spectrum with the incident power-law (ZPOWERLW) and blurred reflection (KDBLUR×REFLIONX) models after correcting for the Galactic absorption (TBABS). The parameters of the REFLIONX model are iron abundance (Fe/solar), ionization parameter ($\xi = 4\pi F/n$, F is the total illuminating flux, n is hydrogen density), normalization (A_{REF}) of the reflected spectrum and photon-index (Γ) of the incident power-law. The convolution model KDBLUR has four free parameters: emissivity index (q , where emissivity of the reflected emission is defined by $\epsilon \propto r^{-q}$), inner disk radius (r_{in}), outer disk radius (r_{out}) and disk inclination angle (i°). The outer disk radius was fixed at $r_{\text{out}} = 400r_g$. In XSPEC, the 0.3–8 keV model reads as TBABS×(KDBLUR×REFLIONX+ZPOWERLW) which provided reasonably good fit with $\chi^2/\text{d.o.f} = 191.9/152$. However, the residual spectrum shows an absorption feature ~ 1 keV which was modelled with the ionized absorber model (ZXIPCF). The multiplication of the warm absorber model improved the fit to $\chi^2/\text{d.o.f} = 165.8/150 = 1.1$ ($\Delta\chi^2 = -26.1$ for 2 additional free parameters). In XSPEC, the 0.3–8 keV best-fitting model reads as TBABS×ZXIPCF×(KDBLUR×REFLIONX+ZPOWERLW). The EPIC-PN mean spectrum, the best-fitting absorbed blurred reflection model and the deviations of the observed data from the best-fitting model are shown in Figure 9 (left). The best-fitting values for the emissivity index, inner disk radius, disk ionization parameter, inclination angle and spectral index are $q = 9.4^{+p}_{-3.8}$, $r_{\text{in}} = 1.24^{+0.23}_{-p} r_g$, $\xi = 499.8^{+37.3}_{-330.7}$ erg cm s $^{-1}$, $i^\circ = 50.7^{+4.5}_{-20.2}$ and $\Gamma = 2.16^{+0.09}_{-0.08}$, respectively. We also fitted the five time-resolved spectra jointly with the

Table 2. The spectral parameters obtained from the time-averaged and the joint fitting of 5 time-resolved spectra for the best-fitting phenomenological model: TBABS×ZXIPCF(ZBBODY+ZPOWERLW). The parameter z_{cloud} is the redshift of the absorbing cloud relative to the rest frame. Parameters with notations ‘(f)’ and * denote fixed and tied values, respectively. ^a Power-law normalization in units of photons $\text{cm}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1} \text{keV}^{-1}$ at 1 keV. ^b Flux in the energy range 0.3–8 keV in units of $\text{erg cm}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$.

Component	Parameter	Average Spectrum	Int 1	Int 2	Int 3	Int 4	Int 5
			0 – 38 ks	38 – 48 ks	48 – 54 ks	54 – 60 ks	60 – 73 ks
TBABS	$N_{\text{H}}(10^{20} \text{ cm}^{-2})$	2.7(f)	2.7(f)	2.7*	2.7*	2.7*	2.7*
ZXIPCF	$N_{\text{H}}(10^{23} \text{ cm}^{-2})$	$10.9^{+3.0}_{-5.3}$	$11.3^{+3.1}_{-5.2}$	11.3*	11.3*	11.3*	11.3*
	$\log \xi(\text{erg cm s}^{-1})$	$2.9^{+0.1}_{-0.1}$	$2.9^{+0.1}_{-0.1}$	2.9*	2.9*	2.9*	2.9*
	C_f	1(f)	1(f)	1*	1*	1*	1*
	z_{cloud}	$-0.063^{+0.027}_{-0.028}$	$-0.073^{+0.035}_{-0.031}$	-0.073*	-0.073*	-0.073*	-0.073*
ZBBODY	kT_{BB}	$111.7^{+3.1}_{-3.1}$	$107.8^{+4.8}_{-2.3}$	$109.9^{+5.0}_{-5.0}$	$115.6^{+7.5}_{-7.4}$	$115.7^{+6.0}_{-5.7}$	$112.2^{+4.8}_{-4.8}$
	$A_{\text{BB}}(10^{-5})$	$2.6^{+1.6}_{-1.1}$	$1.5^{+1.1}_{-0.6}$	$3.6^{+2.6}_{-1.5}$	$8.9^{+7.0}_{-4.0}$	$5.0^{+3.6}_{-2.1}$	$3.7^{+2.7}_{-1.6}$
ZPOWERLW	Γ	$1.98^{+0.2}_{-0.18}$	$2.08^{+0.28}_{-0.27}$	$1.65^{+0.3}_{-0.3}$	$1.99^{+0.4}_{-0.41}$	$1.79^{+0.29}_{-0.29}$	$1.84^{+0.34}_{-0.32}$
	$A_{\text{PL}}(10^{-4})^a$	$1.9^{+1.6}_{-0.9}$	$1.2^{+1.0}_{-0.6}$	$1.9^{+1.7}_{-1.1}$	$8.6^{+7.5}_{-4.4}$	$3.2^{+2.9}_{-1.6}$	$1.8^{+1.7}_{-0.9}$
FLUX	$F_{\text{BB}}(10^{-12})^b$	$1.1^{+0.02}_{-0.02}$	$0.61^{+0.02}_{-0.02}$	$1.52^{+0.05}_{-0.06}$	$3.98^{+0.21}_{-0.22}$	$2.21^{+0.09}_{-0.09}$	$1.61^{+0.05}_{-0.06}$
	$F_{\text{PL}}(10^{-12})^b$	$0.82^{+0.03}_{-0.03}$	$0.52^{+0.04}_{-0.04}$	$1.03^{+0.11}_{-0.1}$	$3.78^{+0.41}_{-0.37}$	$1.61^{+0.18}_{-0.16}$	$0.85^{+0.1}_{-0.09}$
	χ^2/ν	168.1/153	327.7/261	327.7/261*	327.7/261*	327.7/261*	327.7/261*

blurred reflection model and tied every parameter to its mean spectral best-fitting value except the normalization (A_{REF}) of the reflection component. This provided an unacceptable fit with $\chi^2/\text{d.o.f} = 380.2/279 = 1.36$. We then set the normalization (A_{PL}) of the illuminating continuum to vary between the 5 spectra and obtain a noticeable improvement in the fitting with $\chi^2/\text{d.o.f} = 334.7/274 = 1.22$ ($\Delta\chi^2 = -45.5$ for 5 additional free parameters). If we leave the spectral index (Γ) of the primary continuum to vary, we did not get any significant improvement in the fitting. The results obtained from both time-averaged and time-resolved spectroscopy are listed in Table 4. The 5 EPIC-PN spectral data-sets, the best-fitting blurred reflection model and residuals are shown in Fig. 9 (right).

3.4. Flux–Flux Analysis

The flux–flux analysis is a model-independent approach to distinguish the main components responsible for the observed spectral variability and was pioneered by Churazov, Gilfanov & Revnivtsev (2001) and Taylor, Uttley & McHardy (2003). On the basis of our X-ray spectral modelling, we identified the 0.3–1 keV and 1–10 keV energy bands as representatives of the soft excess and primary emission, respectively. Then we constructed the 0.3–1 vs 1–10 keV flux–flux plot which is shown in Figure 10 (top panel). The mean count rate

in the soft and hard bands are $0.33 \pm 0.01 \text{ counts s}^{-1}$ and $0.04 \pm 0.008 \text{ counts s}^{-1}$, respectively. We begin our analysis by fitting the flux–flux plot with a linear relation of the form, $y = ax + b$, where y and x represent the 1–10 keV and 0.3–1 keV band count rates, respectively. The straight line model provided statistically unacceptable fit with $\chi^2/\text{d.o.f} = 56.7/31$ and implied that the immanent relationship between the soft excess and primary emission is not linear. Therefore we fit the flux–flux plot with a power-law plus constant (PLC) model of the form, $y = \alpha x^\beta + c$ (where $y \equiv 1 - 10 \text{ keV}$ and $x \equiv 0.3 - 1 \text{ keV}$ count rates) following the approach of Kammoun, Papadakis & Sabra (2015). The PLC model explains the data statistically well with $\chi^2/\text{d.o.f} = 41.4/30 = 1.38$. The best-fitting PLC model is shown as a solid line in Fig. 10 (top). The best-fitting power-law normalization, slope and constant values are $\alpha = 0.11^{+0.01}_{-0.01} \text{ counts s}^{-1}$, $\beta = 1.63^{+0.29}_{-0.26}$ and $c = 0.012^{+0.004}_{-0.005} \text{ counts s}^{-1}$, respectively. The PLC best-fitting slope is significantly greater than unity which indicates the presence of intrinsic variability in the source. The detection of positive ‘c’-value in the flux–flux plot implies the existence of a distinct spectral component which is less variable than the primary X-ray continuum and contributes $\sim 31\%$ of the 1–10 keV count rate at the mean flux level. In or-

Table 3. The best-fitting spectral model parameters for the disk Comptonization model: TBABS×ZXIPCF×OPTXAGNF. The parameter z_{cloud} is the redshift of the absorbing cloud relative to the rest frame. Parameters with notations ‘(f)’ denote frozen values.

Component	Parameter	Average Spectrum	Int 1	Int 2	Int 3	Int 4	Int 5
			0 – 38 ks	38 – 48 ks	48 – 54 ks	54 – 60 ks	60 – 73 ks
TBABS	$N_{\text{H}}(10^{20} \text{ cm}^{-2})$	2.7(f)	2.7*	2.7*	2.7*	2.7*	2.7*
ZXIPCF	$N_{\text{H}}(10^{23} \text{ cm}^{-2})$	$10.2^{+3.6}_{-4.7}$	10.2*	10.2*	10.2*	10.2*	10.2*
	$\log \xi(\text{erg cm s}^{-1})$	$2.9^{+0.1}_{-0.1}$	2.9*	2.9*	2.9*	2.9*	2.9*
	C_f	1(f)	1*	1*	1*	1*	1*
	z_{cloud}	$-0.063^{+0.027}_{-0.023}$	-0.063*	-0.063*	-0.063*	-0.063*	-0.063*
OPTXAGNF	$M_{\text{BH}} (M_{\odot})$	10^7 (f)	10^7 *	10^7 *	10^7 *	10^7 *	10^7 *
	d (Mpc)	397(f)	397*	397*	397*	397*	397*
	$\frac{L}{L_E}$	$0.08^{+0.03}_{-0.06}$	$0.04^{+0.001}_{-0.001}$	$0.1^{+0.003}_{-0.003}$	$0.27^{+0.01}_{-0.01}$	$0.14^{+0.004}_{-0.004}$	$0.1^{+0.003}_{-0.003}$
	a	0.998(f)	0.998*	0.998*	0.998*	0.998*	0.998*
	$r_{\text{corona}} (r_g)$	$4.9^{+p}_{-1.6}$	4.9*	4.9*	4.9*	4.9*	4.9*
	kT_e (keV)	$0.11^{+0.007}_{-0.003}$	0.11*	0.11*	0.11*	0.11*	0.11*
	τ	> 50.0					
	Γ	$1.99^{+0.19}_{-0.19}$	1.99*	1.99*	1.99*	1.99*	1.99*
	f_{pl}	$0.51^{+0.07}_{-0.05}$	0.51*	0.51*	0.51*	0.51*	0.51*
	χ^2/ν	168.3/151	364.3/279	364.3/279*	364.3/279*	364.3/279*	364.3/279*

der to investigate this issue further, we computed the unabsorbed (without the Galactic and intrinsic absorption) primary continuum and soft excess flux in the full 0.3–8 keV band for all 5 intervals using XSPEC convolution model CFLUX and plotted the intrinsic primary power-law flux as a function of the soft excess flux which is shown in Fig. 10 (bottom). The best-fitting normalization, slope and constant parameters, obtained by fitting the F_{PL} vs F_{BB} plot with a PLC model, are $\alpha_{\text{mod}} = 0.21^{+0.14}_{-0.1}(\times 10^{-12}) \text{ erg cm}^{-2}\text{s}^{-1}$, $\beta_{\text{mod}} = 2.01^{+0.44}_{-0.43}$ and $c_{\text{mod}} = 0.44^{+0.1}_{-0.11}(\times 10^{-12}) \text{ erg cm}^{-2}\text{s}^{-1}$, respectively. Interestingly, we found steeping in the F_{PL} vs F_{BB} plot with an apparent positive constant which is in agreement with the 0.3–1 vs 1–10 keV flux–flux plot. Our flux–flux analysis suggests that the primary continuum and soft excess emission are well correlated with each other, although they vary in a non-linear fashion.

3.5. The Fractional rms Spectrum

In order to estimate the percentage of variability in the primary continuum and soft excess emission, and also to quantify the variability relation between them, we derived and modelled the fractional rms variability

spectrum of PG 1404+226. First we extracted background subtracted light curves in different energy bands from the simultaneous and equal length (70 ks) combined EPIC-PN+MOS data with a timing resolution of $\Delta t = 5$ ks. Then we computed the frequency-averaged ($f \sim [1.4 - 10] \times 10^{-5} \text{ Hz}$) fractional rms, F_{var} in each light curve using the method described in Vaughan et al. (2003). The source shows an increase in fractional variability with energy which can be explained in the framework of two components: soft excess and primary hard X-ray emission with decreasing relative importance of soft excess and increasing dominance of intrinsic primary emission with energy. We constructed fractional rms spectral model using our best-fitting phenomenological and physical mean spectral models in ISIS V.1.6.2-32 (Houck & DeNicola 2000).

First we explored the phenomenological fractional rms spectral model in which both soft excess (ZBBODY) and primary emission (ZPOWERLW) are variable in normalization only and are coupled with each other. Using

Table 4. The best-fitting spectral model parameters for blurred reflection model: TBABS×ZXIPCF(KDBLUR*REFLIONX+ZPOWERLW). Parameters with notations ‘(f)’ and * denote fixed and tied values, respectively. ^a Power-law normalization in units of photons cm⁻² s⁻¹ keV⁻¹ at 1 keV.

Component	Parameter	Average Spectrum	Int 1	Int 2	Int 3	Int 4	Int 5
			0 – 38 ks	38 – 48 ks	48 – 54 ks	54 – 60 ks	60 – 73 ks
TBABS	$N_H(10^{20} \text{ cm}^{-2})$	2.7(f)	2.7*	2.7*	2.7*	2.7*	2.7*
ZXIPCF	$N_H(10^{23} \text{ cm}^{-2})$	$15.8^{+1.4}_{-3.7}$	15.8*	15.8*	15.8*	15.8*	15.8*
	$\log \xi(\text{erg cm s}^{-1})$	$2.9^{+0.1}_{-0.05}$	2.9*	2.9*	2.9*	2.9*	2.9*
	C_f	1(f)	1*	1*	1*	1*	1*
	z	0.098(f)	0.098*	0.098*	0.098*	0.098*	0.098*
KDBLUR	q	$9.4^{+p}_{-3.8}$	9.4*	9.4*	9.4*	9.4*	9.4*
	$r_{\text{in}}(r_g)$	$1.24^{+0.23}_{-p}$	1.24*	1.24*	1.24*	1.24*	1.24*
	$r_{\text{out}}(r_g)$	400(f)	400*	400*	400*	400*	400*
	i°	$50.7^{+4.5}_{-20.2}$	50.7*	50.7*	50.7*	50.7*	50.7*
REFLIONX	Fe/solar	$8.1^{+3.7}_{-3.1}$	8.1*	8.1*	8.1*	8.1*	8.1*
	Γ	2.16*	2.16*	2.16*	2.16*	2.16*	2.16*
	$\xi(\text{erg cm s}^{-1})$	$499.8^{+37.3}_{-330.7}$	499.8*	499.8*	499.8*	499.8*	499.8*
	$A_{\text{REF}}(10^{-7})$	$1.1^{+3.8}_{-0.3}$	$0.6^{+0.02}_{-0.02}$	$1.4^{+0.06}_{-0.06}$	$3.8^{+0.25}_{-0.25}$	$2.0^{+0.11}_{-0.11}$	$1.5^{+0.06}_{-0.06}$
ZPOWERLW	Γ	$2.16^{+0.09}_{-0.08}$	2.16*	2.16*	2.16*	2.16*	2.16*
	$A_{\text{PL}}(10^{-4})^a$	$1.09^{+1.2}_{-0.5}$	$0.7^{+0.2}_{-0.2}$	$1.1^{+0.5}_{-0.5}$	$7.6^{+2.1}_{-2.1}$	$2.7^{+0.9}_{-0.9}$	$0.57^{+0.5}_{-0.5}$
	χ^2/ν	165.8/150	334.7/274	334.7/274*	334.7/274*	334.7/274*	334.7/274*

the equation 4 of Mallick et al. (2016), we obtained the expression for theoretical fractional rms spectral model:

$$F_{\text{var}} = \frac{\sqrt{[(\frac{\Delta A_{\text{PL}}}{A_{\text{PL}}} f_{\text{PL}})^2 + (\frac{\Delta A_{\text{BB}}}{A_{\text{BB}}} f_{\text{BB}})^2 - 2\gamma \frac{\Delta A_{\text{PL}}}{A_{\text{PL}}} \frac{\Delta A_{\text{BB}}}{A_{\text{BB}}} f_{\text{PL}} f_{\text{BB}}]}}{f_{\text{PL}}(A_{\text{PL}}, E) + f_{\text{BB}}(A_{\text{BB}}, E)} \quad (2)$$

where $\frac{\Delta A_{\text{PL}}}{A_{\text{PL}}}$ and $\frac{\Delta A_{\text{BB}}}{A_{\text{BB}}}$ represent fractional changes in the normalization of the primary power-law, f_{PL} and blackbody, f_{BB} components respectively. γ measures the correlation or coupling between f_{PL} and f_{BB} .

We then fitted the 0.3–8 keV fractional rms spectrum of PG 1404+226 using this ‘two-component phenomenological’ model (equation 2) and the best-fitting mean spectral model parameters as the input parameters for the above model. This model describes the data reasonably well with $\chi^2/\text{d.o.f} = 3.48/4 = 0.87$. The best-fitting rms model parameters are: $\frac{\Delta A_{\text{PL}}}{A_{\text{PL}}} = 83.9^{+6.2\%}_{-5.9\%}$, $\frac{\Delta A_{\text{BB}}}{A_{\text{BB}}} = 78.5^{+2.5\%}_{-2.5\%}$ and $\gamma = 0.96^{+0.04}_{-0.38}$. The fractional rms variability spectrum, the best-fitting ‘two-component phenomenological’ model and residuals are shown in Figure 11.

In PG 1404+226, the soft excess was modelled by two different physical models: intrinsic disk Comptonization and blurred reflection from the ionized accretion disk. In order to break the degeneracy between these two possible physical scenarios, we made fractional rms spectral model considering our best-fitting disk Comptonization and blurred reflection models to the time-averaged spectrum.

In the disk Comptonization scenario, the observed variability in PG 1404+226 was driven by variation in the accretion rate as inferred from the joint fitting of 5 EPIC-PN spectra. Therefore the expression for theoretical fractional rms (see Mallick et al. 2016) can be written as

$$F_{\text{var}} = \frac{\sqrt{\langle (\Delta f(\frac{L}{L_E}, E))^2 \rangle}}{f(\frac{L}{L_E}, E)} \quad (3)$$

where $f(\frac{L}{L_E}, E)$ represents the best-fitting OPTXAGNF model and $\frac{L}{L_E}$ is the scaled accretion rate which is the only variable free parameter in the model. The fitting




Figure 10. Top panel: The 1–10 keV count rate is plotted as a function of the 0.3–1 keV count rate with time bin size of 2 ks. The solid line represents the best-fitting power-law plus constant (PLC) model. Bottom panel: The unabsorbed primary power-law flux vs blackbody flux in the full 0.3–8 keV band obtained from 5 different intervals (marked as 1,2,3,4 and 5). The dashed line shows the best-fitting PLC model fitted to the data.

of the 0.3–8 keV fractional rms spectrum using this model (equation 3) resulted in statistically poor fit with $\chi^2/\text{d.o.f} = 15.3/6 = 2.6$. The fractional variability spectrum, the ‘one-component disk Comptonization’ model and residuals are shown in Figure 12 (left).

Then we investigated the blurred reflection scenario where the origin of soft excess was explained in terms of disk irradiation (Crummy et al. 2005). In this scenario, the rapid variability in PG 1404+226 can be described due to changes in the normalization of the reflection component and illuminating power-law continuum as evident from the time-resolved spectroscopy. Thus, we constructed the ‘two-component blurred reflection’ model where both reflection (KDBLUR*REFLIONX) and intrinsic continuum (ZPOWERLW) are variable in normalization only and are perfectly coupled with each other.




Figure 11. Top: The combined EPIC-PN+MOS 0.3–8 keV fractional rms spectrum of PG 1404+226. The solid red line represents the best-fitting fractional rms which consists of a ‘two-component phenomenological’ model in which both soft excess (ZBBODY) and primary emission (ZPOWERLW) are variable in normalization only and are correlated with each other. Bottom: The deviation of the observed fractional rms from the best-fitting model and is given with reference to $\Delta\chi = (\text{data-model})/\sigma$. The solid straight line is the best-fitting residual corresponding to $\Delta\chi = 0$.

Mathematically, the expression for fractional rms can be written as

$$F_{\text{var}} = \frac{\sqrt{\langle (\Delta f(A_{\text{PL}}, A_{\text{REF}}, E))^2 \rangle}}{f(A, E)} \quad (4)$$

where

$$f(A_{\text{PL}}, A_{\text{REF}}, E) = f_{\text{PL}}(A_{\text{PL}}, E) + f_{\text{REF}}(A_{\text{REF}}, E) \quad (5)$$

Here $f_{\text{PL}}(A_{\text{PL}}, E)$ and $f_{\text{REF}}(A_{\text{REF}}, E)$ represent the best-fitting incident power-law (ZPOWERLW) and blurred reflection (KDBLUR*REFLIONX) components, respectively. The two free parameters of this model are A_{PL} and A_{REF} . We then fitted the observed fractional rms spectrum using that model (equation 4) and obtained statistically acceptable fit with $\chi^2/\text{d.o.f} = 4.35/5 = 0.87$. The fractional rms variability spectrum, the best-fitting ‘two-component blurred reflection’ model and residuals are shown in Figure 12 (right). The fractional variations in the normalization of the illuminating continuum and reflected emission are $\frac{\Delta A_{\text{PL}}}{A_{\text{PL}}} = 92.7^{+p}_{-24.7}\%$ and $\frac{\Delta A_{\text{REF}}}{A_{\text{REF}}} = 78.2^{+2.4}_{-2.4}\%$ respectively.

4. SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

We presented results from our *XMM-Newton* observation of the NLS1 galaxy PG 1404+226 and studied the large-amplitude X-ray variability, the UV/X-ray connection, the origin of the soft X-ray excess and its connection with the intrinsic power-law emission through a detailed analysis of the time-resolved X-ray spectra, frequency-averaged ($f \sim [1.4 - 10] \times 10^{-5}$ Hz) X-ray frac-




Figure 12. The 0.3–8 keV fractional rms spectra, the best-fitting models and residual spectra. The best-fitting rms consists of ‘one-component disk Comptonization’ (OPTXAGNF) model with variable accretion rate (Left panel) and ‘two-component blurred reflection’ model in which both reflection (KDBLUR*REFLIONX) and intrinsic continuum (ZPOWERLW) are variable in normalization only and are perfectly coupled with each other (Right panel).

tional rms spectrum and UV/X-ray cross-correlation. Below we summarize our results:

1. PG 1404+226 showed large-amplitude (a factor of ~ 8 in about 11 ks) X-ray variability with fractional rms $F_{\text{var,X}} = 89.0 \pm 0.7\%$. The rapid X-ray variability had been observed in a few NLS1 galaxies (e.g. NGC 4051: Gierliński & Done 2006, 1H 0707–495: Fabian et al. 2012, Mrk 335: Wilkins et al. 2015). The UV emission from PG 1404+226 is much less variable ($F_{\text{var,UV}} = 3.9 \pm 0.2\%$) compared to the X-ray variability and is observed to lead the X-ray emission by ~ 33 ks.
2. The source exhibited a strong soft excess below ~ 1 keV, which was modelled by intrinsic disk Comptonization as well as blurred reflection component. The X-ray (0.3–8 keV) spectra revealed the presence of a highly ionized ($\xi \sim 800 \text{ erg cm s}^{-1}$) absorbing cloud along the line-of-sight with column density of $N_{\text{H}} \sim 10^{24} \text{ cm}^{-2}$.
3. The time-resolved spectroscopy shows significant variability in the soft excess and primary power-law flux, although there was no noticeable variations in the soft excess temperature ($kT_{\text{SE}} \sim 0.11 \text{ keV}$) and photon index ($\Gamma \sim 2$) of the primary continuum.
4. In the disk Comptonization scenario, the rapid X-ray variability can be attributed to a change in the mass accretion rate as indicated by time-resolved spectroscopy. However, the modelling of the X-ray fractional rms spectrum using ‘one-component disk Comptonization’ model cannot reproduce the observed X-ray variability pattern and indicates reflection origin for the soft excess emission (see Fig. 12).
5. In the reflection scenario, we found that the observed large-amplitude X-ray variability was predominantly due to two components: illuminating continuum and reflected emission which are variable in normalization only (see Fig. 12).
6. The inner disk radius estimated from the blurred reflection model is $r_{\text{in}} < 1.47 r_{\text{g}}$ which implies a rapidly rotating black hole at the center of PG 1404+226 and is consistent with the measurement performed by Crummy et al. (2005). The non-detection of the 6.4 keV iron emission line is perhaps due to its smearing into the broad shape in the spectrum.
7. We found that the soft (0.3–1 keV) and hard (1–10 keV) band count rates are correlated with each other and vary in a non-linear manner as suggested by the steepening of the flux-flux plot. The fitting of the hard-vs-soft counts plot with a power-law plus constant (PLC) model reveals a significant positive offset at high energies which can be interpreted as corroboration for the presence of a less variable reflection component (probably smeared iron emission line) in the hard band.

The observed UV variability in PG 1404+226 is weak with $F_{\text{var,UV}} = 3.9 \pm 0.2\%$ only, whereas the X-ray variability is much stronger ($F_{\text{var,X}} = 89.0 \pm 0.7\%$). We found that the UV variations lead the X-ray variations by ~ 33 ks in PG 1404+226. Similar behaviour had also been observed in another Seyfert 1 galaxy MCG-6-30-15 (Arévalo et al. 2005). The time-lag between the

UV and X-ray variations in MCG-6-30-15 was found to be ~ 160 ks and interpreted as a signature of the accretion flow propagation. The UV lead observed in PG 1404+226 is much shorter than that seen in MCG-6-30-15, although PG 1404+226 is hosting more massive (a factor of 10) black hole than MCG-6-30-15. The observed lead of ~ 33 ks for variations in the UV emission compared to the variations in the X-ray emission is likely to be the result of the thermal Comptonization of the UV seed photons in a compact hot corona. In this process, the UV lead can occur due to (i) the light-crossing time between the UV emitting region of the disk and the compact hot corona, and (ii) the time required for the multiple inverse Compton scattering of UV photons into X-ray photons. The light-crossing time required by the UV photons to reach the compact hot corona can be written as (Dewangan et al. 2015)

$$\tau = 2.6 \times 10^5 \left(\frac{\lambda_{\text{eff}}}{3000\text{\AA}} \right)^{4/3} \left(\frac{\dot{M}}{\dot{M}_E} \right)^{1/3} \left(\frac{M_{\text{BH}}}{10^8 M_\odot} \right)^{2/3} \text{ s} \quad (6)$$

where $\frac{\dot{M}}{\dot{M}_E}$ is the scaled mass accretion rate, M_{BH} is the central black hole mass in units of $M_\odot$ and λ_{eff} is the effective wavelength where the disk emission peaks. In the case of PG 1404+226, $M_{\text{BH}} \sim 10^7 M_\odot$, $\frac{\dot{M}}{\dot{M}_E} \sim 0.08$ (calculated from the unabsorbed flux in the energy band 0.001 – 100 keV using the convolution model CFLUX in XSPEC) and $\lambda_{\text{eff}} = 2910\text{\AA}$ for UVW1 filter. Therefore the light crossing time between the X-ray source and the disk is ~ 23.1 ks, which corresponds to the peak disk emission radius of $\sim 460r_g$. Recent results on X-ray reprocessing lags (McHardy et al. 2014; Edelson et al. 2015; McHardy et al. 2016; Fausnaugh et al. 2016) have shown that the AGN disks are larger than that predicted for the standard disks. However, we did not observe the reprocessing lag. The UV emission from PG 1404+226 is most likely to be dominated by the intrinsic emission from the disk. In the framework of Compton up-scattering, a UV photon with energy E_{UV} after N scatterings produces an X-ray photon of energy (Zdziarski 1985)

$$E_X = A^N E_{\text{UV}}, \quad (7)$$

where $A = 1 + 4\theta + 16\theta^2$, $\theta = \frac{k_B T_e}{m_e c^2}$ and T_e and m_e are the electron temperature and rest mass, respectively. If t_c is the time delay between successive scattering and the X-ray photons are produced within the optically thin, hot corona after N scatterings, then the Comptonization timescale is

$$t_{\text{comp}} = N t_c. \quad (8)$$

For an optically thin ($\tau < 1$), hot ($T_e \sim 100$ keV) corona of size $r \sim 10r_s$, the estimated Comptoniza-

tion timescale is $t_{\text{comp}} \sim 8.7$ ks. Thus the observed UV lead of ~ 33 ks can indeed correspond to the sum of the light-crossing time (~ 23.1 ks) between the disk and power-law emitting region and the Comptonization timescale (~ 8.7 ks) of the UV seed photons within the hot corona.

In the intrinsic disk Comptonization (OPTXAGNF) model, the soft excess emission results from the Compton up-scattering of the UV seed photons by optically thick, warm ($kT_{\text{SE}} \sim 0.1 - 0.2$ keV) electron plasma in the inner disk (below r_{corona}) itself. However, if the optically-thick corona is the inner disk, it is unlikely that it will intercept significant amount of seed photons from intermediate or outer disk. Thus, the seed photons for the optically-thick thermal Comptonization must arise from the inner regions of the standard cold disk. Hence, the soft excess emission from the Comptonized inner disk and the intrinsic UV emission from the intermediate regions of standard cold disk are likely to be connected only via the propagation of accretion rate fluctuations, and the intrinsic UV emission from the standard disk should lead the soft excess by the propagation fluctuation timescale. Assuming that the fluctuations in the accretion rate propagate with the speed of sound waves in the radial direction, the timescale of propagation fluctuation $t_{\text{sound-r}}$ can be written as (Czerny 2006)

$$t_{\text{sound-r}} = t_{\text{dyn}} \left(\frac{r}{h} \right), \quad (9)$$

where the dynamical time scale $t_{\text{dyn}} = \sqrt{\frac{GM}{r^3}}$, h is the disk height at the radius $r \sim 460r_g$ for the observed UV emission. If we consider a thin disk for which height-to-radius ratio, $h/r \sim 0.1$ (Czerny 2006), the propagation fluctuation timescale at this emission radius ($r \sim 460r_g$) is of the order of $\sim 5 \times 10^6$ s which is much longer than the observed UV lead. Hence, the observed UV lead is unlikely to be due to the propagation of accretion rate fluctuations. Unlike the Comptonized inner disk in the OPTXAGNF model, the hot corona is likely spherical and can intercept significant fraction of UV seed photons. Thus, in the framework of OPTXAGNF model, the UV lead is entirely due to the Comptonization of seed photons in the hot corona. In this case, it is difficult to explain the correlation between the soft excess and the power-law components unless the variability is intrinsic resulting from simultaneous gravitational energy release both to the inner, Comptonized disk and the hot corona. However, it is difficult to explain the UV–X-ray connection as the propagation fluctuation timescale is longer compared to the observed UV lead. Therefore the only possible explanation for the observed UV lead is that the UV seed photons from the disk travel all the way up

to the hot electron plasma, get Compton up-scattered within the compact hot corona and produces the X-ray power-law component.

PG 1404+226 shows strong X-ray variability with increase in overall fractional rms with energy. We attempted to explain the observed rapid variability of PG 1404+226 in the framework of two possible physical scenarios: intrinsic disk Comptonization and blurred reflection from the ionized accretion disk. In the disk Comptonization scenario, if the rapid X-ray variability is due to the mass accretion rate changes which is favoured by the time-resolved spectroscopy, then it cannot explain the rms variability pattern below 0.4 keV and in the hard band (see Fig. 12, left). Therefore, it is unlikely that the rapid X-ray variability is caused by variations in the mass accretion rate alone. On the other hand, the soft excess and primary continuum vary non-linearly (as $F_{\text{primary}} \propto F_{\text{excess}}^{2.01}$) which indicates that the soft excess is coupled and reciprocating with the primary continuum variations. This is in agreement with the smeared reflection scenario which is further supported by the high emissivity index ($q \sim 9.4$). Moreover, the fractional variability spectrum of PG 1404+226 is best described by two components—illuminating continuum and reflected emission which vary in normalization only and perfectly coupled with each other. The variations in the reflected component and primary continuum are $\sim 78\%$ and $\sim 93\%$, respectively. In the blurred reflec-

tion model, the soft excess is a consequence of the disc irradiation by a hot, compact corona close to the black hole. The correlated, non-linear variability between the illuminating continuum and soft excess emission is consistent with the light bending model (Miniutti et al. 2003, 2004; Miniutti & Fabian 2004; Fabian & Vaughan 2005). Our results indicate that the thermal Comptonization of the UV seed photons from the accretion disk produces the X-ray power-law component which in turn illuminates the innermost accretion disk giving rise to the soft X-ray excess emission in PG 1404+226.

5. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

LM gratefully acknowledges support from the University Grants Commission (UGC). This research has made use of processed data of *XMM-Newton* observatory through the High Energy Astrophysics Science Archive Research Center Online Service, provided by the NASA Goddard Space Flight Center. This research has made use of the NASA/IPAC Extragalactic Database (NED), which is operated by the Jet Propulsion Laboratory, California Institute of Technology, under contract with the NASA. Figures in this manuscript were made with the PYTHON package MATPLOTLIB and GUI scientific plotting package VEUZ. This research made use of ASTROPY, a community-developed core Python package for Astronomy.

REFERENCES

- Arnaud, K. A., Branduardi-Raymont, G., Culhane, J. L., et al. 1985, MNRAS, 217, 105
- Arnaud, K. A., 1996, ASPC, 101, 17
- Arévalo, P., Papadakis, I., Kuhlbrodt, B., Brinkmann, W., 2005, A&A, 430, 435
- Alexander T., 2013, preprint (arXiv:1302.1508)
- Astropy Collaboration et al., 2013, A&A, 558, 33
- Boroson, T. A. & Green, R. F., 1992, ApJS, 80, 109
- Boller, T., Brandt, W. N., Fink, H., 1996, A&A, 305, 53
- Churazov, E., Gilfanov, M., Revnivtsev, M., 2001, MNRAS, 321, 759
- Crummy, J., Fabian, A. C., Brandt, W. N., Boller, Th., 2005, MNRAS, 361, 1197
- Crummy, J., Fabian, A. C., Gallo, L., Ross, R. R., 2006, MNRAS, 365, 1067
- Czerny, B., Nikoajuk, M., Róañska, A., Dumont, A.-M., Loska, Z., Zycki, P. T., 2003, A&A, 412, 317
- Czerny, B., 2006, ASPC, 360, 265
- Dasgupta, S., Rao, A. R., Dewangan, G. C., Agrawal, V. K., 2005, ApJ, 618, 87
- Dewangan, G. C., Griffiths, R. E., Dasgupta, S., Rao, A. R., 2007, ApJ, 671, 1284
- Done, C., Davis, S. W., Jin, C., Blaes, O., Ward, M., 2012, MNRAS, 420, 1848
- Dewangan, G. C., Pawar, P. K., Pal, M., 2015, ASInC, 12, 57
- Edelson, R., Gelbord, J. M., Horne, K., McHardy, I. M., et al., 2015, ApJ, 806, 129
- Fabian, A. C., Ballantyne, D. R., Merloni, A., Vaughan, S., Iwasawa, K., Boller, Th., 2002, MNRAS, 331L, 35
- Fabian, A. C., Vaughan, S., 2005, MNRAS, 340, L28
- Fabian, A. C., Zoghbi, A., Wilkins D., Dwelly, T., Uttley P. et al., 2012, MNRAS, 419, 116
- Fausnaugh, M. M., Denney, K. D., Barth, A. J., Bentz, M. C., et al. 2016, ApJ, 821, 56
- Gaskell, C. M., 2006, ASPC, 360, 111
- García, J., Dauser, T., Lohfink, A., Kallman, T. R., et al., 2014, ApJ, 782, 76
- Ghosh, R., Dewangan, G. C., Raychaudhuri, B., 2016, MNRAS, 456, 554

- Gierliński, M., Done, C., 2004, MNRAS, 349, 7
- Gierliński, M. & Done, C., 2006, MNRAS, 371, L16
- Goodrich, R. W., 1989, ApJ, 342, 224
- Grupe, D., Beuermann, K., Mannheim, K., Thomas, H.-C., 1999, A&A, 350, 805
- Haardt, F. & Maraschi, L., 1991, ApJ, 380, 51
- Haardt, F. & Maraschi, L., 1993, ApJ, 413, 507
- Houck, J. C. & DeNicola, L. A., 2000, ASPC, 216, 591
- Jansen, F. et al., 2001, A&A, 365, L1
- Janiuk, A., Czerny, B., Madejski, G. M., 2001, ApJ, 557, 408
- Kaspi, S., Smith, P. S., Netzer, H., Maoz, D., Jannuzi, B. T., Giveon, U., 2000, ApJ, 533, 631
- Kalberla, P. M. W., Burton, W. B., Hartmann, D., et al., 2005, A&A, 440, 775
- Kammoun, E. S., Papadakis, I. E., Sabra, B. M., 2015, A&A, 582, 40
- Komossa, S., Meerschweinchen, J., 2000, A&A, 354, 411
- Leighly, K. M., Mushotzky, R. F., Nandra, K., Forster, K., 1997, ApJ, 489, L25
- Leighly, K. M., 1999, ApJS, 125, 297
- Leighly, K. M., 1999, ApJS, 125, 317
- Laor, A., 1991, ApJ, 376, 90
- Magdziarz, P., Blaes, O. M., Zdziarski, A. A., Johnson, W. N., Smith, D. A., 1998, MNRAS, 301, 179
- Mason K.O. et al., 2001, A&A, 365, 36
- Miniutti, G., Fabian, A. C., Goyder, R., Lasenby, A. N., 2003, MNRAS, 344, L22
- Miniutti, G., Fabian, A. C., Miller, J. M., 2004, MNRAS, 351, 466
- Miniutti, G., Fabian, A. C., 2004, MNRAS, 349, 1435
- Miniutti, G., Fabian, A. C., Anabuki, N., Crummy, J. et al., 2007, PASJ, 59S, 315
- McHardy, I. M., Cameron, D. T., Dwelly, T., Connolly, S., et al, 2014, MNRAS, 444, 1469
- McHardy, I. M., Connolly, S. D., Peterson, B. M., et al., 2016, AN, 337, 500
- Mallick L., Dewangan, G.C., Gandhi P. et al, 2016, MNRAS, 460, 1705
- Osterbrock, D. E. & Pogge, R. W., 1985, ApJ, 297, 166
- Papadakis, I. E., Brinkmann, W., Page, M. J., McHardy, I., Uttley, P., 2007, A&A, 461, 931
- Ross, R. R., Fabian, A. C., Mineshige, S., 1992, MNRAS, 258, 189R
- Ross R.R., Fabian A.C., 2005, MNRAS, 358, 211
- Singh, K. P., Garmire, G. P., Nousek, J. 1985, ApJ, 297, 633
- Strüder, L. et al., 2001, A&A, 365, L18
- Taylor, R. D., Uttley, P., McHardy, I. M., 2003, MNRAS, 342, 31
- Ulrich-Demoulin, M.-H., Molendi, S., 1996, ApJ, 457, 77
- Vaughan, S., Reeves, J., Warwick, R., Edelson, R., 1999, MNRAS, 309, 113
- Vaughan, S., Edelson, R., Warwick, R. S., Uttley, P., 2003, MNRAS, 345, 1271
- Véron-Cetty, M.-P., Véron, P., Gonçalves, A. C, 2001, A&A, 372, 730
- Wang, T., Brinkmann, W., Bergeron, J., 1996, A&A, 309, 81
- Wang T., Lu Y., 2001, A&A, 377, 52
- Wilkins, D. R., Gallo, L. C., Grupe, D., Bonson, K., Komossa, S., Fabian, A. C., 2015, MNRAS, 454, 4440
- Zdziarski, A. A., 1985, ApJ, 289, 514
- Zu Y., Kochanek C. S., Peterson B. M., 2011, ApJ, 735, 80
- Zu Y., Kochanek C. S., Kozowski S., Udalski A., 2013, ApJ, 765, 106